WR 100 N1/N2

Fall 2014

**Peer Review of Paper 1 Introduction Draft**

**Purpose:** Reading and critiquing the work of others benefits both the author and reader of a piece of writing. The author benefits by receiving an outside perspective, enabling him or her to improve his or her work through revision. The reader benefits by sharpening his or her editorial skills—skills that, later on, can be applied to the reader’s own work.

**Task:** Email a copy of your introduction to you assigned peer. Then read your peer’s introduction and respond to the questions below. When both you and your peer have had time to complete this sheet, email your comments and the marked up version of the introductions to each other. Finally, provide oral feedback.

**Logistical Matters:** Please type your comments on this Word doc and, where instructed, mark up your peer’s introduction.

In addition to emailing your work to your peer, you should post both your comments and your mark-up of your peer’s intro to your WordPress site: specifically, to a page titled “Review of Peer Intro Draft,” with “Paper 1” selected as the parent page.

After you have received your peer’s comments on your intro and his or her mark-up of your intro, post those documents to your WordPress site: specifically, to a page titled “Review of My Intro Draft,” with “Paper 1” selected as the parent page.

**Comments:** The benefits of this exercise can be realized only if you critique your peer’s work honestly. While you should be respectful, you should assume your peer is open-minded and more interested in writing to the best of her or his ability than in hearing empty praise.

Note: the aim of this peer review is *not* proofreading or sentence-level revision. Rather, your focus should be the overall structure of the introduction and the ideas expressed. Being a native or non-native English speaker has virtually no bearing on your ability to analyze introduction structure and ideas. That said, if you don’t understand the intended meaning of something your peer has written, you should ask him or her to explain.

**Your name:** *Neel Doshi*

**Your peer’s name:** *Yang Wang*

1. Does the intro break down into three parts (common ground/background, problem/destabilizer, and resolution/claim/thesis) or into four parts (common ground/background, problem condition/destabilizer, problem consequence/significance, and resolution /claim/thesis)? Three parts would be sufficient. Four would be ideal. On the intro, use the insert comment feature to precisely label the parts. When you provide your peer with spoken feedback, explain why you think the intro breaks down this way.

In my opinion, the introduction breaks down into four parts.

1. Are all parts of the intro sufficiently detailed? Or would the reader be better prepared for the upcoming argument if he or she had additional information? Or is anything in the intro unnecessary or redundant?

In the background part of the introduction, giving some examples of how cultures, religions, customs effect how people eat might help the reader understand the rest of the essay a bit better. I think your problem condition is great and interesting but I don’t think that the problem consequence should be stated as a question. Try changing the problem consequence part of the introduction into a statement. Even after reading the thesis, I am a little unsure about what the essay is going to be about. Is it about tips for eating with people from different cultures or is it about your own personal experiences?

1. Is the resolution /claim/thesis sufficiently *specific* and *narrow*? Test it in the following way. First, copy and paste the resolution /claim/thesis onto this sheet. Second, use the insert comment feature to highlight key terms. Third, in each comment bubble, try asking basic reportorial questions (who, what, why, when, where, how) about each key term.

Thesis: For people who have different backgrounds but want to eat together, there are more they should consider about before having a meal.

1. Is the resolution /claim/thesis *arguable* or *debatable*? Test it by reversing it. Type the reversed resolution /claim/thesis on this sheet. If the reversed claim is false or trivial, then your peer’s claim isn’t arguable. Explain why you think your peer’s claim is or isn’t arguable. (Note: you don’t need to reverse every grammatical part of the claim, just its essential meaning. For example, the reverse of “cats are nice pets” isn’t “pets nice are cats”; rather, it’s “cats are not nice pets.”)

Reverse: For people who have different backgrounds but want to eat together, there is nothing they should consider about before having a meal.

Although the reverse of the thesis makes sense and is arguable, the reverse is something that its not very easy to defend. However, it still makes sense and supports the fact that the thesis of the paper is debatable and arguable.

1. Overall, how does the intro strike you? Is it clear? Does it pique your interest?

Overall, I like the introduction. Although it is vague in some areas and needs a little tightening up, I think the topic of the essay is both interesting to read and promising. With a stronger thesis and cleaner sentence structure, this essay would definitely be something I would want to read.

Can people from different cultures have a nice dinner together? There are so many cultures, religions, customs in the world, and they affect how people eat. Eating habit is considered as a part of a man without exception. Some people do not eat meat while some people are addicted to meat. So how should they eat together properly, without offending each other and meanwhile satisfying their stomachs? What about people who have different religions and are in contradiction with each other's dietary habits? It seems people who come from the same cultural background are easier to have a good meal together. For people who have different backgrounds but want to eat together, there are more they should consider about before having a meal.